

Remarks/Interview Summary

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview on January 24, 2008. In the interview the amendments set forth below were discussed.

The Office Action rejected Claims 130-280 due to double patenting. Applicant submits with this response a terminal disclaimer for U.S. patent 7,047,275; U.S. Patent 7,035,906; U.S. Patent 7,024,449; U.S. Patent 6,732,141; U.S. Patent 6,725,250; and U.S. Patent 6,167,428. Applicant believes these are all of Applicant's patents that have claims that share the aspect of a firewall configured to control access to portions of the microchip from the network. Note that Applicant has many pending applications (11/338,887, 11/329,423, 11/196,527, 10/684,657, 10/802,049, 10/663,911 and 09/935,779), but that, at this time, Applicant is only submitting a terminal disclaimer for U.S. Patent Application 09/085,755 because Applicant is confident that only this application will issue with the most recent set of claims that includes claims that share the aspect of a firewall configured to control access to portions of the microchip from the network. At the present time, although the other patent applications include claims directed to the aspect of a firewall configured to control access to portions of the microchip from the network, prosecution is ongoing and such applications may or may not issue with such claims.

In addition, the Office Action rejected Claims 130-280 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner indicated that these claims would be allowed if rewritten to overcome the indefinite rejection. Applicant has made the changes suggested by the Examiner, and has also reviewed the application and made additional similar changes. In particular, Claim 134, as well as other claims, has been amended to state "at least one second personal computer" instead of "the second personal computer". Claim 138 and 140, as well as other claims, have been amended to state "shared use" instead of "shared operation". Claim 139,

as well as other claims, has been amended to delete the phrase "such as". Claim 171, as well as other claims, has been amended to state that "there is" a connection. Claim 175, as well as other claims, has been amended to state that the microchip "is configured to allow" active configuration. Claim 186 has been amended to change "the personal communications device" to "the personal computer". Claim 191 has been amended to state that there is "also" an optical fiber network connection.

It should be noted that Applicant has changed the phrase "comprising . . . a" to "comprising . . . at least one" throughout the claims to make explicit that "comprising . . . a" means "comprising . . . one or more". This is consistent with the meaning of the claims in all of Applicant's other patents and patent applications, even though the claims in these other patents and patent applications have not been changed to "comprising . . . at least one".

Applicant believes the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone should the Examiner believe that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER US LLP



Dale Lazar
Registration No. 28,872

Lisa K. Norton
Registration No. 44,977

PO Box 9271
Reston, Virginia 20195-3171
Telephone No. (703) 773-4149
Facsimile No. (703) 773-5200